

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/720,096		NILSSON ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	David J. Steadman		1656	

All Participants:

(1) David J. Steadman.

(2) Ms. Robin L. Teskin.

Date of Interview: 26 October 2010

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

NONE

Claims discussed:

28,29

Prior art documents discussed:

NONE

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/David J. Steadman/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1656

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Time: _____

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Claims 28-29 recite *L. lactis* strains DN105 and MBP71, respectively. In reviewing the Declarations regarding biological deposits of these strains filed on 11/14/02, the examiner noted to Ms. Teskin on 10/15/10 that these Declarations refer to each of the strains as a "plasmid". In order to clarify the Declarations, the examiner requested that applicant's representative submit a statement that the deposits made were microorganisms or bacteria and not plasmids. On 10/19/10, Ms. Teskin confirmed that the paper filed on 10/18/10 refers to the biological deposit Declarations filed on 11/14/02. In a further discussion on 10/21/10 regarding duplicate claims, the examiner noted that claim 43 is a substantial duplicate of claim 37 and Ms. Teskin agreed to amend claim 43 by examiner's amendment to depend from claim 30. In a further discussion on 10/25/10 regarding descriptive support, Ms. Teskin agreed to amend claim 36 to conform to the language of the specification at p. 17, lines 18-19 and to cancel claim 41.